

**Town of Leicester Planning Board
Meeting Minutes**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Debra Friedman, Vice-Chair; Sharon Nist, David Wright

ASSOCIATE MEMBER: Carol Pappas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jason Grimshaw, Alaa AbuSalah

IN ATTENDANCE: Michelle Buck, Town Planner; Barbara Knox, Board Secretary

MEETING DATE: August 23, 2016

MEETING TIME: 7:00PM

AGENDA:

- 7:00PM Application Discussion:
 Site Plan Review Amendment, Fire/EMS Headquarters, 1 & 3 Paxton Street
 (Town of Leicester)
- 7:15PM Application Discussion:
 Site Plan Review Amendment, Cherry Valley Solar, 148 Henshaw Street
- 7:30PM Public Hearing (continued):
 Special Permit/Site Plan Review for Bus Storage and Residential, 100 South Main
 St (AA Transportation)
- 7:45PM Application Discussion (continued)
 Site Plan Review, LaFlash Boutilier Solar Farm (ZPT Energy Solutions, LLC)
- 8:00PM Approval of Minutes
- 6/7/2016
 - 6/21/2016
- 8:30PM Town Planner Report/General Discussion:
- Miscellaneous Project Updates

Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:00PM

Application Discussion:

Site Plan Review Amendment, Fire/EMS Headquarters, 1 & 3 Paxton Street (Town of Leicester)
Mr. Chris Logan of Donham & Sweeney Architects made the presentation. The proposed addition is a training tower for the Fire/EMS Headquarters. The training tower was part of the original design but the price came in too high in the fall, so it was eliminated. The bid that came in this spring, there was a gap between the budgeted amount appropriated by the Town. Therefore, there was a recommendation made by the building committee to proceed with design for a training tower.

Reviewing the footprint of the building, it shows the tower on the northwest corner. The tower would be nested into the building and will stick out beyond the building approximately 7 feet and will align with the west face of the building. The tower will not be any closer to the west property line and 7 feet further from the north side, which will have it come closer to one abutting property line.

The definitive impervious coverage on the site will not increase and will actually decrease from the originally design submitted. There will not be any additional runoff and the storm management design for the building will remain the same.

The top of the apparatus bay sits 20 feet from the pavement and the tower is 15 feet above that, so the tower is 35 feet at the highest point. The roof slopes gently down to deposit water onto the apparatus roof, so there will be no additional runoff onto the ground around the tower. The runoff will be captured by the internal drainage system that feeds into the underground stormwater treatment system.

Mr. Logan reviewed the building elevation from the west property line towards the back of the apparatus bay. The tower will sit right of the apparatus bay and extend 15 feet above the apparatus garage roof. There will be two metal shutters that swing into the tower and are used during rescue training operations.

Mr. Friedman asked for the site elevation facing north. Mr. Logan reviewed the previous site plan and the revised site plan showing the tower. He said they will be extending the masonry work 15 feet above the edge of the apparatus bay to the height of 35 feet above the pavement, which is below the peak of the main portion of the building. The view from the west and north, even with the tower, will be less imposing than first thought. Overall, the building has decreased in square footage and in volume

Ms. Friedman asked if the use would be for high ladder training. Mr. Logan said yes, high ladder rescue training. There is also an internal staircase that the department will use allowing fire fighters to assist other fire fighters lift people in and out of the shutter openings or out of the building. There will be a drain at the bottom of the tower to capture the water when they wash down the equipment.

Ms. Friedman asked if there will be lights on the outside. Mr. Logan said no.

Ms. Friedman asked at what time of the day would this facility be used. Fire Chief Wilson said training is on Monday nights and could be anywhere up until 9PM. Ms. Friedman asked what type of disruption it would cause abutters. Mr. Wilson said it shouldn't cause any disruption because it will be basically used for ladder training. There may be other nights added, but as of right now, training is on Monday nights and goes anywhere from 6PM to 9PM.

Mr. Jon Webster, 51 Paxton Street, asked if ladder training was every Monday night. Mr. Wilson said no, they do other training as well and all training, as of right now, is on Mondays.

Ms. Friedman asked if there will be no lights on this tower inside and outside. Mr. Wilson said there will be lights on the inside. Ms. Friedman asked if they can do training when it's dark. Mr. Wilson said that they can still have training when it's dark.

Mr. Logan explained that the tower won't be illuminated at all because when they go to fight a fire, they would kill the power to the structure. There will be internal lights just for opening up the building and shutters, because the shutters are latched from the inside.

Mr. Wright asked if there would be spotlights. Mr. Wilson said if they need to put on any lights, the trucks would be brought around the back of the building to turn on any spotlights.

Ms. Friedman asked how that will affect abutters. Mr. Wilson said no different from originally planned. Ms. Sandy Wilson said the entire west wall is a training wall to begin with and it would be no different with the tower, other than the extra 15 feet. Mr. Logan said any lighting associated with the building would be directed away from abutting properties. Mr. Wilson said there won't be ladder training every Monday night. There are different forms of training at different times of the year.

Mr. Wright asked if this tower will be the same type of facility as the training tower in the Town of Auburn. Mr. Logan said this tower is not designed to burn. Mr. Wilson said they didn't want a burning tower and when they want to do fire training, they go to Auburn.

Mr. Logan explained his firm has designed quite a few fire and safety buildings and there hasn't been one within the last 5 to 10 years that wasn't designed to have 2 or 3 different training types of designs to them. This design is particular to Leicester.

Ms. Friedman asked Mr. Logan if he had designed a lot of fire stations. Mr. Logan said within the last 4 years, they have designed 15 fire stations. Ms. Friedman asked if most of those stations were placed in a residential area. Mr. Logan said there were a few and most of the outside training walls and structures were actually facing the residential neighborhoods, having much less property between the building and the homes.

Mr. Wilson pointed out that the fire stations Mr. Logan pointed out, were located in residential areas, have their training during the day. The Town of Leicester will need to make a decision, if they want the fire department to train during the day, they will need to hire full-time people and the Town of Leicester can't afford full-time people. At some point in time, they will need to make that decision.

Ms. Friedman said she would not disagree that the Town will need to make that decision, but her concern was how this will affect the abutters with fire trucks pulling out at night and the noise of the ladders during training. Mr. Wilson questioned the concern with noise, because he felt the abutters would be here if they had that concern. He noted they would make some noise, but he was trying to determine how much noise Ms. Friedman was talking about. Ms. Friedman said that is what she is trying to determine, how much noise, because a large amount of the vegetated buffer was removed from the lower part of the field. She was not expecting to see that much of the buffer removed.

Mr. Logan said they found there was a lot of dead growth that needed to be removed, but they will be adding a number of new trees, new shrubbery as a buffer and thorny growth around the detention basins. He noted that since the last meeting, the building committee agreed to add a 6 foot fence all along the north and west property lines.

Mr. Webster, 51 Paxton Street, asked if the arborvitaes were still proposed along his property line. Mr. Logan said that has not changed.

Ms. Friedman asked if there would be a change to the onsite lighting as a result to the amount of vegetation removed. Mr. Logan said the exterior door to the north has a small LED light that's focused at the door itself and not part of the parking lot lighting. There will be a light on the exterior door of the tower on the west side and the exterior door at the main entrance to the building

Mr. Wright asked if additional lighting was proposed to the building along the west elevation, in that particular corner, to light the parking lot. Mr. Logan said the onsite lighting to the property will remain the same.

Ms. Carol Pappas said she lives across the street from the current fire station and the noise was minimal, even on their training night. Truck sirens were not turned on until they enter onto Route 9. She felt that they try to be considerate of their neighbors.

Ms. Friedman asked if ladder training was done at the current station and was there any noise created from that training. Mr. Wilson said ladder training was done at the current station and the noise level was minimal. During the spring and summer months, a lot of their training was done outside, and in the winter months, they plan their training for inside. Right now, when they get back from a fire, the trucks are parked outside to be repacked and worked on because the current station is not big enough inside. With the new station and the 20 foot ceilings, they can back the trucks in and close the door to repack and work on the trucks.

Mr. Wright asked the extent of the 6 foot vinyl fence and was it going along the west property line, as well as coming out to the street on the northern portion. Mr. Logan said his understanding was the fence would run the entire length of the north and the west property lines. He wasn't sure where it stopped on the west side, but the fence will screen the majority of the properties.

Ms. Buck didn't note any major concerns. She said the training was proposed on the originally approved plan and this and was just a higher tower. She also noted it's a municipal use allowed by-right.

Mr. Webster said he appreciated the sensitivity the Board has taken regarding the abutters, because with a fire station going next to someone's home, there will definitely be a change in their lives a little bit. Ms. Friedman noted that his property would be behind the fence and that will definitely help with noise.

Ms. Kristen Bulak, 26 Warren Ave, said her property directly abuts where this station is going and they will definitely see this structure and they will hear the noise more because their house sits high on their lot. They will definitely hear the noise with the extra 15 feet. Mr. Logan said in that area, they added a number of tall growing Arborvitae and lower growing Rhododendron. He felt once the buildings are up, people may find that they actually sit low on the lot. The front

portion of the building is a 3 story portion built into the hill, the first two levels are in the hill, and the third floor will be the first floor off Paxton Street.

Ms. Bulak asked if training nights could end before 9PM for the children who are in bed before 9PM. Mr. Wilson said training will not be every night of the week and it's rare they go past 9PM. He will see how it goes in the first 6 months and adjust from there.

Ms. Pappas said she lives in a duplex across from the current fire station and her 7 and 10 year old grandchildren live on the other side. The 7 year old is in bed by 6:30PM every night when there's school.

Mr. Wilson said as for the trucks coming and going, the ambulance is the busiest with approximately 1,200 calls a year and 950 transports all hours of the day, and they don't go blasting down the driveway with their sirens on.

Mr. Webster asked to confirm a tower that would have fire would not have been permitted. Mr. Wilson agreed because the lot was not big enough. Ms. Wilson said they would need another lot to have what Auburn has.

Ms. Bulak asked if there will be other Towns using this training facility. Mr. Wilson said no.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board or public, Ms. Friedman asked for a motion

MOTION: Mr. Wright moved to approve the Amendment to the Site Plan Approval & Stormwater Permit for an addition of a 35-foot training tower & 6-foot high vinyl fencing around the property's northwest corner of the Fire/EMS Headquarters property lines.

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Application Discussion

Site Plan Review Amendment, Cherry Valley Solar, 148 Henshaw Street

Mr. Scott Martin of Fuss & O'Neil made the presentation. They are before the Board to modify Site Plan Approval for a 1-Megawatt Solar Array. He explained that the scope of work will remain the same, but there has been some modification proposed to the shape of the elevation near Henshaw Street. They were having difficulty dealing with the two ridgelines that go through the site in the north and south orientation. They will add grading around the racks that produce the electricity within the limited disturbance area. The applicant had switched out the panel model, with a higher efficiency model, which reduced the footprint of the array itself within the disturbance area.

The proposed additional grading will consist of cutting the southern end of the site and filling the northern end to level the site to a more consistent slope across the array. Because of the wetlands, they are limited to the amount of work they can do around that area and had not changed on how close they are working towards the wetlands. In effect, they will be providing a slightly flatter slope across the site and there are no hydrological changes proposed.

They will work with the direct abutter on the placement of the trees and shrubbery along that property line. They did propose and the Board approved 25 evergreen shrubs and a 6 foot high stockade fence along the property line as well.

From the southern side of the property, the panels will be placed lower so there won't be a view from Henshaw Street. The panels will be kept 150 feet from the property line and the minimal clearing line will be a little over 60 feet. The area outside the centerline will be cleared of the tall trees over 50 feet and all the shrubbery will remain. They modified the solar sediment control plan by adding some additional controls along the slopes.

Some comments received had to do with the availability of topography on the western part of the site, and how the grading will affect the southern property. The revised document reflects all that additional information and shows the topography around the entire perimeter of the site.

Mr. Wright asked where the stonewall was located that was mentioned in their response to Quinn Engineering. Mr. Martin said along the southern property line. Mr. Wright asked if the stonewall was part of a retaining wall. Mr. Martin said no

Mr. Martin reviewed comments from Quinn Engineering. He said the first couple of comments received from Quinn Engineering had to do with showing the topography and information depicting the extent of the existing grades, which they provided in the revised plan. Another comment was regarding the proposed volume of earthwork and they are currently calculating that so they won't have to import any material. The applicant would really like to try to balance out the site as much as possible, so they won't have to truck out any material. Quinn's general comments had to do with how they will manage ledge and if blasting would be required, to seek proper permitting. They will certainly apply for any permits necessary if blasting is required. The next comment is the potential for intercepting groundwater from the cuts to the top of the slope and that diversion swales and additional stabilization maybe necessary. The final comment speaks on removal of the motorhome/RV trailer that sits over the property line in the southeastern portion of the grading and they will work with the owner on moving the trailer.

They are asking the Board to consider that once the contract is finalized, their representative inspect the site to look at the trees that will be removed on Henshaw Street to improve the sightline. He felt that would be a good time for the Board to look at what is going on at the site, the delineation of the clearing line, to observe delineation of the limited disturbance, the full surface tanks and to observe the soil conditions. He said that they would also be open to providing diversion swales or anything else along the slope to manage runoff.

They met with the Conservation Commission; they referred all discussion with drainage to the Planning Board. He did mention earlier that hydrology had not changed and in fact probably be improved.

Ms. Friedman asked if the slope would be seeded. Mr. Martin said yes and they will be using straw wattles on this project, providing two rows in addition to the perimeter. Ms. Friedman said given the potential of erosion, what was their timeframe for the construction. Mr. Martin said they plan to start construction in the fall.

Ms. Buck had some concern on just receiving the applicant's comments yesterday and hadn't received Quinn Engineering's review on those comments. She recommended to continue discussion until the first September meeting. Mr. Martin said they were hoping to get a conditional approval and resolve any issues through the administrative offices.

Ms. Friedman said she did not have a problem putting conditions in the Order of Conditions and having Quinn Engineering present when they are doing the testing.

Ms. Buck said if the Board approves tonight they should approving the amendments subject to successfully addressing Quinn Engineering comments dated 8/16/2016 and deferring test pits until construction, as long as they are inspected and that diversion swales be installed as necessary. She will also add that all conditions in the previous approval remain in effect and that the applicant provides the application fee for amendments prior to commencement of work.

Hearing no further questions or comments from the Board or public, Ms. Friedman asked for a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Wright moved to approve the Site Plan Review Amendment for Cherry Valley Solar, 148 Henshaw Street as presented, with the following conditions: 1) That prior to excavation, test pits be performed to determine where the actual groundwater level is where the deep cut sections are adjacent along the southern property line, shall be performed with a representative from Quinn Engineering; 2) diversion swales be installed as necessary, if it's deemed groundwater is present; and 3) the amendment application fee received before the start of construction.

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Public Hearing Cont

Special permit/site plan review for Bus Storage and Residential, 100 Main Street (AA Transportation)

Bruce Williams of Guerriere & Halnon presented the application request. Mr. Ron Ernenwein President of AA Transportation was in attendance.

Ms. Buck informed the applicant that there were not a sufficient number of voting members for tonight's public hearing. She asked if they wanted to proceed having just discussion with no vote and continue to next meeting when a full Board is present or just continue until there is a full Board present before starting any discussion. She noted Special Permit applications need a 4/5th vote to pass.

Mr. Ron Ernenwein wanted to proceed with the public hearing having just discussion.

Ms. Nist disclosed being an abutter to an abutter from this property. [She also filed a written disclosure notice with the Town Clerk after consulting with the State Ethics Commission.]

Mr. Williams said the site is the former Inland Diver's site located at 100 South Main Street. It's a 2 ½ acre site with an existing building and parking. Mr. Ernenwein, owner of AA

transportation, has many school buses that service many school districts throughout the State. He is looking to use a portion of the building as a school bus dispatch office. They have applied for three Special Permits, one for multi-residential for the two existing residential units, the second for the bus dispatch and the third for the existing retail.

The only work proposed on the site will be relative to fire department requiring an increase in the size of the turnaround on the west side for the fire apparatus. There will be a small amount of additional paving, just enough for the turnaround. They've proposed three areas of landscaping where the existing pavement will be taken out, to offset the impervious area. They received the comments from the Town Departments and the Town Planner, Michelle Buck and they included those concerns in their revised plans.

Reviewing the Town Planner's comments, the first comment asked for more detail in the operation of the bus dispatch center and bus storage area. Mr. Williams explained that the buses would leave the lot between 6-6:30AM and return between 1:30-4:30PM.

Ms. Buck's second comment asked to confirm the number of bedrooms in each unit. Mr. Williams explained the unit on the west side appears to be a two-story house attached to the building within itself and the retail is a two bedroom residential apartment.

Ms. Friedman asked how many employees are anticipated. Mr. Williams said they have 14 bus spaces and 8 parking spaces for the bus dispatch center. There will be two employees for the dispatch center and the rest of the spaces would be used for the drivers. There will be a maximum of 16 employees for the bus dispatch center.

Ms. Friedman asked when the bus drivers arrive, where do they park if the buses are already parked there? Mr. Williams said cars will use the bus spaces during the day when the buses aren't there.

Ms. Friedman asked if there was a warm up time for the buses. Mr. Williams said the company has a policy on no idle time greater than 5 minutes. Ms. Friedman asked to confirm that the driver will idle the bus for 5 minutes, pull the bus out and put their car back where the bus was. Mr. Williams agreed.

Ms. Nist asked where the car would be in the meantime. Mr. Williams said this will take place in the early morning and they can park in the retail until they pull the bus out.

Mr. Williams continued. There will be 2 spaces per residential unit.

Ms. Friedman asked to confirm that there will be 4 spaces for residential, and 6 with 2 handicapped for retail. Mr. Williams said 1 handicapped space for retail. They did have additional parking along the side of the building, but the fire chief wanted them removed.

Ms. Friedman asked how many buses would be stored onsite each day. Mr. Williams said a maximum of 14 buses.

Mr. Williams said Quinn Engineering had some comments regarding site distance. Mr. Williams explained that this was an existing parking lot that's been in use for many years, but they did measure the site distance and it's shown on the plan. Ms. Friedman asked what the site distance was. Mr. Williams said 944 feet and 508 feet.

Mr. Williams addressed other comments. He said the Police Department comments were regarding marking the entrance and exit locations with signs and pavement markings, which they have added to the plan. In addition, the Police Department had a question regarding the existing gate on the side of the building. He explained that the driveway is going to be widened and if the gate was put back, it's stated on the plan that a Knox Box will be installed for emergency vehicles, although the owner has stated the gate would not be locked. The Code Enforcement Office met with the applicant onsite and stated having no issues.

Ms. Friedman asked if they were applying for a trucking depot permit. Mr. Williams said no, if approved, they would want it specific to a bus yard. Ms. Buck said the category in the Zoning Bylaw fits this to a trucking depot and that is what the special permit is for, but any decision would describe this for school bus use.

Ms. Friedman asked what kind of retail was being considered, so the Board can determine that there was adequate parking. Mr. Williams said he didn't think that had been determined yet. They did show on the plan 4 parking spaces for retail. Under the Town Bylaw, they are allowed 1 space per 200 square feet of retail, so they made the space for retail to 800 square feet.

Ms. Friedman asked to confirm there were 2 spots for the dispatch office. Mr. Williams said there was a total of 8 for the bus dispatch. Ms. Friedman asked to confirm there were 4 for the residential parking, which leaves none for the retail. Mr. Williams said there will be 4 for retail. They are numbered on the plan S1-S3 and then the handicapped spot.

Ms. Friedman asked where the other spaces were located for the employees. Mr. Williams showed on the plan where 2 additional spots were located.

Mr. Wright said he counts 6; 4 in front of the building and 5, 6, which are labeled as 7 & 8 and that shows 6. Mr. Williams showed the additional spots located where the buses park. Ms. Friedman asked if the 2 additional spots were included with the bus spaces. Mr. Williams said no.

Ms. Friedman asked to confirm 3 for the retail. Mr. Williams said 4 for the retail, plus the handicapped. Ms. Friedman said if there are 4 people parking and one is handicapped, that one can't be used.

Mr. Wright said one handicapped spot is required and understood accessible parking cannot be designated to one particular use, but there could be an accessible employee in dispatch. Mr. Ron Ernenwein said their dispatches are required to have DOT physicals, so if they were handicapped, they wouldn't be able to work for them.

Mr. Williams explained the employees don't arrive in the morning all at once, it's staggered arrival. Mr. Wright asked what happened when the buses return. Mr. Williams said it would be the same thing, staggered. Ms. Buck asked if any buses stayed on site in between. Mr. Williams said no. Ms. Buck asked if the same employees returned in the afternoon. Mr. Williams said yes

Ms. Nist said the parking spaces will be used one way or the other. Mr. Williams said there are 14 buses and there are 8 additional spots. Ms. Nist said she was referring to the bus parking spaces being used one way or the other, either by a bus or car. Mr. Williams said some of them will.

Ms. Friedman said if the buses leave by 6AM, what time do the employees arrive. Mr. Williams said it depends on what time their route starts, between 6-6:30AM and some between 6:30-7AM.

Ms. Nist asked what other Towns will this serve besides Leicester. Mr. Williams said this parking lot will only serve Leicester. Ms. Nist asked if all the buses were going to be the large school buses. Mr. Williams said yes.

Ms. Buck said because the revised plan was just received yesterday, she would like to send it to Quinn Engineering, the Police and Fire Departments for review. She said it does look like they made improvements with access around the building and they will be removing an equivalent amount of pavement. Because this is in a Watershed Overlay District, it's difficult to expand impervious on this site. She still had some concerns on how tight the parking was.

Ms. Friedman asked if any fill was being brought in. Mr. Williams said no.

Ms. Nist asked about snow removal and how it would be done with buses parked there. Mr. Williams pointed out the area where snow would go. Ms. Nist noted there was a slope there and the snow would be pushed down into the abutter's driveway. Mr. Friedman asked how this was going to affect the runoff. Mr. Williams said it won't affect the runoff, there is nothing changing.

Ms. Friedman asked if there was going to be some kind of barrier put around the edge where it slopes off. Mr. Williams said there was no plans for a barrier there because that would concentrate the flow and cause erosion. Ms. Friedman said she did not mean a berm, but more of a parking rail. Mr. Wright agreed because it would keep buses and cars from accidentally going over the edge. Mr. Williams said the pavement stops before the slope and people pulling in can see that.

Ms. Friedman asked if the area not paved can be paved in the future. Ms. Buck said no, where they are proposing the parking is already paved.

Ms. Dolores Fairbanks, 36 Henshaw Street, asked if there were any plans on extending anything there in the future. Mr. Williams said no, other than marking the driveway as required. Ms. Fairbanks said everything that is there will be staying that way. Mr. Williams said yes.

Mr. Wright asked if consideration was given for some kind of traffic signal, such as a flashing yellow light, warning drivers, mainly in the afternoon, who travel along Route 9. Ms. Nist agreed because if traffic is stopped because the center traffic light is red, it can take a while before being able to pull out.

Ms. Friedman asked if curb cuts remained the same. Mr. Williams said yes and assumed they would need to apply for change of use with Mass DOT.

Ms. Buck didn't think a traffic light would be warranted because there wouldn't be a large amount of buses there. Ms. Friedman agreed it probably wouldn't be any worse than people leaving a Little League Game.

Mr. Paul Landry, 457 Pleasant Street, said he is one of the bus drivers and also involved with Town sports at the Little League Field. The light at the center of Town is actually a help because it stops traffic, which allows people to pull out.

Mr. Wright said his concern was in the afternoon when the buses are coming back. He asked at any one given time, how many buses would be pulling out and/or pulling in. Mr. Williams said if they found the traffic bad, they would address it then.

Mr. Kurt Parliment, 44 Henshaw Street, felt traffic will be a problem. He asked how many buses would travel west. Mr. Williams wasn't sure. He said it would probably depend on the time of day. Mr. Parliment said the fire department didn't want that site because of an issue getting up the hill on Route 9 in the winter. He was curious what the difference was between a fire truck and a school bus. He also had concern with this site being in the Water Protection Overlay District. He asked what protection will be in place having all those buses there and if one has a fuel leak, how will they contain fuel from traveling down that slope and protect the reservoir.

Ms. Friedman asked how they would address a problem like that, especially because there's not going to be any kind of berm. Mr. Williams said this is an existing parking lot that's been there for years. Mr. Wright said this is a different type of use then what was there before. He asked if a spill were to happen, how will it be mitigated, because there won't be a berm keeping it from entering into the water supply. Mr. Williams said there is an emergency spill plan in place and they would have contractors out of Marlboro respond to any type of leakage.

Mr. Wright said to address an abutter's concerns and being in the Watershed protection district, he asked if the applicant would be opposed to putting a berm at the edge of the existing parking lot, to mitigate impacts. Mr. Ernenwein said they were not opposed to a berm, but any engineer will tell you if you put in a berm, you will create a pond and the pond will overfill in that area and cause erosion.

Mr. Wright asked if there were any existing catch basins on site. Mr. Williams said there is an existing catch basin in the low corner of the parking lot and there was no berm along that edge. Mr. Wright asked any runoff that comes down will go in the basin. Mr. Williams said it should.

Ms. Friedman asked if the Town Engineer could review that concern. Ms. Buck agreed and asked the applicant to also submit the information regarding the emergency spill plan to have on file. Ms. Friedman explained that the Order of Conditions will include the Emergency Spill Plan, and note that the applicant will maintain that contact.

Mr. Parliment asked if the Cherry Valley Rochdale Water District had any comment regarding this project. Ms. Buck said notice was sent to the applicable water district, which was the Leicester Water District.

Ms. Friedman noted this hearing will need to be continued to September 6, 2016, which will allow the two members absent the opportunity to listen to the recording from tonight's meeting, to vote at the September 6th meeting.

Ms. Buck reminded the applicant they will need the information regarding the Emergency Spill Plan. She will also request additional review from the Town Engineer regarding runoff.

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to continue the Public Hearing for AA Transportation, 100 South Main Street to Tuesday, September 6, 2016 at 7PM.

SECONDED: Mr. Wright – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Application Discussion Cont

Site Plan Review LaFlash Boutilier Solar Farm (ZPT Energy Solutions, LLC)

Mr. Chris Anderson of Hannigan Engineering represented the application on behalf of ZPT Energy Solutions. They received Quinn Engineering's comment letter, but had not been able to respond before now. He submitted revised plans according to Quinn Engineering's comments. They have shown additional erosion control to the site and remainder of the site plan will remain the same. They are still proposing an access drive off Boutilier Road in the northern corner of the property. The access drive will extend the length of the project. There will be detention basins and catch basins located throughout the site to reduce and slow down the stormwater coming off the site. The test pit located in one area where there's a sub-drain system was completed. Mr. Anderson explained the sub-drain system was to ensure the area remained dry and ground water didn't interact adversely with the system itself. Mr. Anderson continued to review comments from Quinn Engineering:

- Comment #2 was in regards to a concentrated flow entering the detention basins, they added riprap around the swales and every 50 feet along the area where the stormwater would generally collect at the proposed access drive; and in addition, a riprap slope will be added along the edge of the basin. An additional concern was the increase in stormwater runoff and they've adjusted the drainage system to account for that.
- Comment #8 was regarding the Water Resource Protection Overlay District and they indicated in their original response letter that they will be no use of herbicide or pesticide within the project area and a note will be added to the O&M Plan.
- Comment #14 regarded the surety and decommissioning estimate and the decommissioning plan indicated a different number than the plan sheets. He explained that currently National Grid said they may be installing an additional pole, so they adjusted the decommissioning estimate and the decommissioning plans.

- Comment #15 asked to confirm responsibility for maintenance of the existing drains within Boutilier Road. They will taking responsibility of structures within the property and they are still working out a determination for the ones that are located in Boutilier Road. Mr. Anderson said at a prior meeting there was some concern regarding the legality and what should happen with Boutilier Road. Their attorney is researching the most feasible method to resolve that issue and they should have a response to that by the next Board meeting.
- Comment #20 asked to include specifications for the gravel and sub-base material for the access lane and that has been added to the site plan.
- Comment #21 was regarding maintenance activities and sediment removal and there is very little sediment concern with this project. Most of the site is maintained through the summer, maintenance in the winter months was limited and the access drive would remain unplowed.
- Comment #22-25 regarding the stormwater issues and they have resolved those issues and the stormwater report will reflect the changes.
- Comments #27 & 28 had to do with clerical and they have corrected that.
- Comment #33 regarded the additional riprap around the catch basins.

Mr. Anderson said those were the main concerns of Quinn Engineering and the legal aspects of Boutilier Road is still being researched to the best feasible way to make it work. Ms. Friedman said that is the Board's main concern and the sooner they submit their proposal on how to deal with this, the better, because it will need to be sent to Town Counsel for review. If not received within a reasonable time for Counsel review, the meeting will be continued again.

Ms. Buck said she spoke with Bill Hannigan at the beginning of the week and there seems to be a huge difference between what was discussed at length at multiple meetings and where we are now. She will be interested to see how these concerns will be addressed. This is an abandoned subdivision and the Board does not want this to be still on the books, as it exists now, because it's an unsecured and it needs to be addressed. Bill Hannigan's initial comment said it was up to the property owner on what was being done with the house. The property owner, Mr. LaFlash, was present and Ms. Buck asked what his plans were with the house. Mr. LaFlash said that was up to the Board and if it needs to come down, he'll take it down. Ms. Friedman felt he would probably need to do.

Ms. Buck explained no one was arguing access to the solar farm, the Board can't leave the issue regarding Boutilier Road hanging; it needs to be addressed. Ms. Friedman added it will need to be very clear, with no gray areas, because at some point in the future, there will be a different Board who won't know the past history here. Ms. Buck said she will also be checking with the Highway Department regarding the extra 1,000 feet of road leading to this solar farm.

Ms. Friedman said this will be continued to the next meeting on September 6, 2016. She asked the applicant if they will be able to have some kind of resolution prior to September 6th that can be submitted to Town Counsel. Mr. Anderson asked the time line; Ms. Friedman noted the sooner the better.

Mr. Bill Wolfe, 692 Stafford Street, asked about the fence being installed. Mr. Anderson said it will be a security fence within the limit of the solar array itself. Ms. Friedman asked Mr. Wolfe

how far his property was from the solar field. Mr. Wolfe said around 200 feet and his concern was with water runoff onto his property. He asked if there was any kind of catch basin there to catch the additional runoff. The wetlands surround his property and the solar site property goes down grade to his. He asked what will stop the water from flooding his property. Mr. Anderson pointed out the 3 wetland areas associated with the project area. He said the limit of work proposed will not affect the wetland area around Mr. Wolfe's property.

Mr. Wolfe submitted pictures showing his property after a severe storm and the water stopping 5 feet before his cellar door. His property is at the low point and if there is nothing that will alleviate the water there, he asked if it will create a problem for him and if it does create a problem, who he should call. Ms. Friedman said they will have the Town Engineer review that to make sure this will not create an additional problem for Mr. Wolfe.

Mr. Wolfe asked any blasting anticipated; Mr. Anderson said none is anticipated.

Mr. Wolfe asked which way the panels will face and if he will get any glare as far as the elevation from the property. Mr. Anderson said the panels will face south and Mr. Wolfe should not get any glare.

Mr. Wolfe asked how far they plan to clear and was it right up to his property line. Mr. Anderson said they will not be clearing much more than already cleared and what will be taken down will be very minimal.

Mr. Wolfe asked if an access was proposed off Stafford Street. Ms. Friedman said no, access will be from Henshaw Street.

Hearing no further discussion; Ms. Friedman asked for a motion to continue.

MOTION: Mr. Wright moved to continue discussion on LaFlash Boutilier Solar Farm to Tuesday, September 6, 2016 with a time to be determined.

SECONDED: Ms. Nist – Discussion: None – Vote: None

Approval of Minutes

6/7/2016

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to approve minutes of June 7, 2016

SECONDED: Mr. Wright – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

6/21/2016

Tabled

Town Planner Report

Miscellaneous Project Updates:

- A new application on Curtis Self-Storage and Contractor's Yard, 1749 Main Street is scheduled to be heard at the September 6th meeting.
- Ms. Nist asked for an update regarding the McNeil Highway Solar Farm Project. Ms. Buck said there hasn't been anything started and their permit will expire sometime this fall.

- Mr. Wright asked for an update regarding the 1603-1605 Main Street Project. Ms. Buck said their permit expires this October.
- Ms. Nist asked for an update regarding Pat Dykas, Stafford Street Mill - American Canine permit. Ms. Buck said the water district had shut the water off to the building because the owner was not complying to what the water district had required.
- Ms. Nist asked about the lot on Huntoon Highway, across from Deer Pond Auto, being filled. Ms. Buck said the Conservation Commission Chair visited the site and reported that the work there is still outside the wetland buffer zone. Ms. Nist asked why the lot was being filled. Ms. Buck said that was not known at this time.

MOTION: Ms. Nist moved to adjourn

SECONDED: Mr. Wright – Discussion: None – VOTE: All in Favor

Meeting adjourned at 9:25PM

Respectfully submitted:

Barbara Knox

Barbara Knox

Documents included in mailing packet:

- Agenda
- Memo to the Board from Michelle Buck regarding August 23rd Planning Board Meeting
- Site Plan Review amendment application for Fire/EMS Headquarters
- Stormwater Management Design update from James Downing to the Planning Board regarding Fire/EMS Headquarters
- Fire/EMS Headquarters conceptual design plan
- Draft copy of Site Plan Approval & Stormwater Permit Order of Conditions Amendment Decision
- Response memo from Andy Glines of Fuss & O'Neil regarding Site Plan Modification on Cherry Valley Solar, 148 Henshaw Street
- Comment letter from Quinn Engineering regarding 148 Henshaw Street, Cherry Valley Solar
- Site Plan Review/Special Permit application for AA Transportation, 100 South Main Street
- AA Transportation conceptual design plan
- Memo to Normand Gamache, Guerriere & Halnon from Michelle Buck regarding AA Transportation
- Comments received from Police Department, Historical Commission, Fire Department, Code Enforcement Officer, regarding AA Transportation Co.
- Comment letter from Quinn Engineering regarding LaFlash Boutilier Solar Field
- Email memo from William Hannigan to Michelle Buck regarding LaFlash Boutilier Solar project
- Email to William Hannigan from Michelle Buck regarding LaFlash Boutilier Solar project
- Copy of Planning Board minutes from September 1, 2015, October 21, 2015.
- Planning Board minutes of June 7, 2016 & June 21, 2016

Documents submitted at meeting:

- Response letter from Andy Glines of Fuss & O'Neil regarding 148 Henshaw Street, Cherry Valley Solar
- Response letter from Bruce Williams of Guerriere & Halnon regarding AA Transportation, 100 South Main Street
- Revised Site Plan showing proposed parking layout at 100 South Main Street